



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/770,937	02/02/2004	John N. Gross	JNG 2004-1	1607
23694 7590 02/03/2010 Law Office of J. Nicholas Gross, Prof. Corp. 2030 ADDISON ST. SUITE 610 BERKELEY, CA 94704				
EXAMINER ROSEN, NICHOLAS D				
ART UNIT 3625		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 02/03/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jngross@pacbell.net
anthonygreek@gmail.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/770,937

Applicant(s)

GROSS, JOHN N.

Examiner

Nicholas D. Rosen

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/17/2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GA-6)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :1/26/2009, 1/28/2009, 1/30/2009, 2/2/2009, 6/10/2009, 8/3/2009, and 12/17/2009.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-36 have been examined.

Claim Objections

Claims 12 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities: In the fourth line of claim 12, "an embedded embedded uniform resource links" should be either "an embedded uniform resource link" or "embedded uniform resource links". Note that there are two errors: the repetition of "embedded", and the inconsistency between "an" and the plural of "links". In the fifth line of claim 12, "said electronic notification" technically poses an antecedent basis problem, because the previous references to the notification do not specify that it is electronic. In the sixth line of claim 12, "said recommender system" technically lacks antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-34

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 15, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hastings et al. (U.S. Patent

6,584,450) in view of Ostrom ("With Newer Releases, Netflix Users Can Anticipate a 'Very Long Wait'"). As per claim 1, Hastings discloses a method of distributing playable media items over an electronic network from a first computer maintained by a provider of a media distribution service to a device used by a subscriber of such service, the playable media items corresponding to machine readable media readable by a subscriber machine player, the method comprising the steps of: (a) setting up a subscriber selection queue for the subscriber to be controlled by the first computer, said subscriber selection queue consisting of an ordered list of one or more playable media items to be delivered to the subscriber in a subscriber-defined priority, wherein said subscriber selection queue is set up at least in part in response to item selection directions provided by the subscriber over the network (column 4, lines 14-34; column 9, line 47, through column 10, line 14; Figure 7; column 11, line 49, through column 13, line 53); (b) setting up queue replenishment rules for the subscriber selection queue, including an automatic queue refill option; and (c) monitoring said subscriber selection queue in accordance with said queue replenishment rules; wherein said subscriber selection queue is maintained automatically for the subscriber so as to include at least one playable media item which could be delivered to such subscriber (ibid.). Between the teaching of Hastings that the customer provides movie selection criteria (column 9, line 47, through column 10, line 14), and the teachings of a first computer carrying out operations (column 11, line 49, through column 13, line 53) and delivering products to subscribers (column 8, line 6, through column 9, line 39), automatically determining with the first computer if an additional media item should be added to the subscriber

selection queue is obvious and implied. Hastings does not expressly disclose a second computer used by the subscriber, but the disclosure of Internet communication and a web browser (e.g., column 9, lines 47-62) implies such a second computer. Selecting more movies in accordance with the queue replenishment rules implies modifying the subscriber selection queue to generate a new ordered list of one or more playable media items (e.g., to include a new release with the subscriber's favorite stars, which is adding an additional playable media item); Hastings does not disclose (d) automatically modifying the subscriber selection queue with said first computer to generate a new ordered list of one or more playable media items in response to the subscriber confirming that said additional playable media item can be included in the subscriber selection queue. However, Ostrom teaches modifying the subscriber queue based on a confirmation from the subscriber to assure that new releases be included at the top (paragraph beginning, "Selecting from Nearly 12,000 Titles"), and Hastings teaches the first computer automatically carrying out operations (column 11, line 49, through column 13, line 53). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to do this, for the stated advantage of ensuring subscribers that they will receive new releases (or other preferred movies, presumably).

Hastings does not expressly disclose that steps (c) and (d) are repeated as needed when the automatic queue refill option is enabled so that the subscriber selection queue is maintained automatically for the subscriber so as to include at least one playable media item which is accepted for delivery by such subscriber, although

Hastings does disclose replenishment control rules that can, in effect, include an automatic queue refill option (column 9, line 63, through column 10, line 14), and this automatic selection process appears to be directed to assuring a queue containing movies for subscribers to rent. However, Ostrom further teaches a recommendation process to lead consumers to movies they might not otherwise have known about (paragraph beginning, "Using a proprietary algorithm-based technology"). Because this is described as "lead[ing] consumers to movies they might not otherwise have known about," rather than automatically delivering movies based on recommendations, and because, "Based on rentals driven by the Netflix recommendation system, the niche movie 'Memento' has become the ninth-most *requested* film of all time by Netflix users," it is implied that at least some movies are accepted for delivery by the subscribers. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for steps (c) and (d) to be repeated as needed when the automatic queue refill option is enabled so that the subscriber selection queue is maintained automatically for the subscriber so as to include at least one playable media item which is accepted for delivery by such subscriber, for the stated advantage of keeping Netflix's vast library in circulation, with the obvious advantage of making Netflix a valuable service for which subscribers are likely to remain willing to pay, and assuring that playable media items are actually desired by the subscribers.

As per claim 2, there is no suggestion in Hastings that the subscriber needs to be connected while the computer performs step (c).

As per claim 3, Ostrom teaches subscribers reordering their delivery sequences, implying such an ordered list from a first item to a last (paragraph beginning, "Selecting from Nearly 12,000 Titles").

As per claim 4, Ostrom teaches the additional playable media item being inserted in a subscriber-defined delivery order position (paragraph beginning, "Selecting from Nearly 12,000 Titles"), and given the teaching of Hastings of a computer carrying out operations (column 11, line 49, through column 13, line 53), doing this automatically is held to be obvious and implied.

As per claim 7, Hastings discloses delivering the new playable media items to the subscriber (*ibid.*).

As per claim 8, Hastings does not expressly disclose that step (d) is performed automatically with sending a further notification to the subscriber, but there is no disclosure that a further notification to the subscriber is sent, and the teaching of Ostrom that most users don't remember which movies are on the top of their lists anyway (bottom paragraph on first page) implies that subscribers are not notified.

As per claim 15, Hastings discloses a trigger event to determine delivery of an item to a subscriber (column 5, lines 1-14; column 14, lines 1-17), which implies modifying the subscriber selection queue (at least by deleting the item now delivered).

As per claim 17, Hastings discloses a determination by an item recommendation system that an additional playable media item should be added to the subscriber selection queue as a recommended playable item (*ibid.*, as applied to claim 1), implying

a trigger event associated with such a determination (e.g., when a new movie with a subscriber's favorite actor is released).

As per claim 18, Ostrom discloses that the recommended playable media item can be designated as the next to be delivered from the subscriber selection queue (paragraph beginning, "Selecting from Nearly 12,000 Titles", as applied to claim 1).

As per claim 19, Hastings discloses that the additional playable media item is determined by a recommender system of the media distribution service which automatically identifies items of interest based on a subscriber preference profile (ibid., as applied to claim 1).

As per claim 22, Hastings discloses that queue replenishment control rules for the subscriber selection queue can be set up automatically for the subscriber based on an evaluation of item preferences determined for the subscriber (column 9, line 63, through column 10, line 14).

As per claim 23, Hastings discloses that queue replenishment control rules for the subscriber selection queue can be set up by the subscriber (column 9, line 63, through column 10, line 14).

As per claim 24, Hastings does not expressly describe moving an item from the subscriber to a shipping queue when the subscriber is eligible to receive an additional item, but does disclose shipping items to subscribers, and, once shipped, the items would presumably not remain on the queue of items to be delivered, so defining the record where the items would then be listed as a shipping queue is trivial.

As per claim 28, Hastings discloses that the media distribution service distributes movies to subscribers (ibid.)

As per claim 29, Hastings discloses that the media distribution service is an Internet based movie rental service, and the playable media items are recordings of movies that are mailed to subscribers (ibid., and column 10, lines 29-41).

As per claim 30, Hastings discloses that the subscriber can have a predetermined number of recordings checked out, by implication for a flat fee (columns 5 and 6, "MAX OUT").

As per claim 31, Hastings discloses that a subscriber is charged an additional fee when an additional playable media item is distributed (column 6, lines 14-29).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hastings and Ostrom as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Raphel et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0023743). Hastings does not disclose automatically inserting an additional item as the first item to be delivered, but it is well known to add items to the top of a list, as taught, for example, by Raphel (paragraph 61). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to do so, for the obvious advantage of making an especially desired item available as soon as possible.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hastings and Ostrom as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Berstis (U.S. Patent 6,105,021). Hastings does not disclose automatically inserting an additional item as the last item to be delivered, but it is well known to add items to the bottom of a list, as

taught, for example, by Berstis (column 8, lines 40-45). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to do so, for the obvious advantage of enabling higher-priority items to be delivered first.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hastings and Ostrom as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Postelnik et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2006/0218054). Hastings does not disclose sending a notification to the subscriber after step (c) when the queue replenishment control rules determine that the subscriber selection queue should be modified, but it is well known to send customers notifications of pending deliveries, modifications to their orders, etc., as taught, for example, by Postelnik (paragraph 74). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to send such a notification, for such obvious advantages as assuring a subscriber of the imminent shipment of desired items, or enabling a subscriber to modify his preference list to receive a more desired item (as set forth in Ostrom).

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hastings, Ostrom, and Postelnik as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of official notice. As per claim 10, official notice is taken that sending notification that something should be done, or has been done, does not necessarily trigger doing it. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the notification not to automatically

trigger a modification of the subscriber selection queue, for the obvious advantage of not changing the queue of whose current state notification had just been sent.

As per claim 11, Hastings discloses modifying the subscriber selection queue in accordance with queue replenishment rules (*ibid.*, as applied to claim 1 above), and if one is modifying the queue, and sending a notification, sending a notification of how one is modifying the queue is trivial. (This particular information could be considered non-functional descriptive material in any case.)

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hastings, Ostrom, and Postelnik as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Jacobi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,317,722). Hastings discloses modifying the subscriber selection queue in accordance with queue replenishment rules (*ibid.*, as applied to claim 1 above), and if one is modifying the queue, and sending a notification, sending a notification of how one is modifying the queue is trivial. Hastings does not disclose that the notification includes an embedded uniform resource link (URL) or an electronic response field in the notification so as to allow the subscriber to review playable media title recommendations from a recommender system, but Jacobi teaches notifications including hyperlinks to allow a user to review recommendations from a recommender system (column 10, lines 54-62). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the notification to include an embedded uniform resource link (URL) or an electronic response field, for the obvious advantage of profiting from selling (or renting) items to the subscriber that the subscriber is likely to be interested in.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hastings, Ostrom, Postelnik, and Jacobi as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Davis et al. (U. S. Patent 6,105,006). Hastings does not disclose that the subscriber selection queue is automatically modified in accordance with the queue replenishment rules after a predefined time delay, but it is well known to take action after a predefined time delay, as taught, for example, by Davis (column 23, lines 16-26). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the subscriber selection queue to be automatically modified in accordance with the queue replenishment rules after a predefined time delay, for at least the obvious advantage of giving someone (the subscriber, or an administrator), time to make any manual modification which seem indicated.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hastings, Ostrom, and Postelnik as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Nakagawa (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0046129). Hastings does not disclose that the notification provides directions for the subscriber to accept and/or modify said additional playable media item, but Ostrom, as noted, discloses the subscriber modifying (or, by default, accepting) a list, and it is well known to provide directions, as taught, for example, by Nakagawa (display of directions in paragraph 41). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to provide such directions, for the obvious

advantage of enabling the subscriber to readily modify (or accept) the queue according to his wishes.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hastings and Ostrom as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Kamel et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0014145). Hastings does not disclose that the trigger event is associated with a quantity of playable media items remaining in said subscriber delivery queue, but a trigger event could be associated with a quantity of playable media items remaining in the delivery queue in several ways (e.g., the queue might have become too large or too small), and it is well known at least to add additional items to a queue which has become too small, as taught, for example, by Kamel (paragraphs 161, 162, 167, and 168). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the trigger event to be associated with a quantity of playable media items remaining in said subscriber delivery queue, for the obvious advantage of assuring an adequate quantity of playable media items in the queue.

Claims 20 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hastings and Ostrom as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of official notice. Hastings does not disclose processing an item rating survey provided by the subscriber to determine a subscriber item preference profile suitable for use by the recommender system, but official notice is taken that it is well known to process item rating surveys to determine preference profiles for use in recommending items. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at

the time of applicant's invention to do so, for the obvious advantage of recommending items likely to be of interest to subscribers, and thus making subscriptions more attractive, and collecting corresponding fees.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hastings and Ostrom as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of official notice. As per claim 21, Hastings does not disclose that the additional playable media item is randomly selected from a list of playable media items associated with a category selected by the user, although Hastings discloses the user selecting a category (column 8, lines 6-65). However, official notice is taken that it is well known to select an item at random from a list. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to do so, for the obvious advantage of providing a recommended item that would have had to be chosen somehow, perhaps in the absence of any particular known reason to choose one item from a category rather than another.

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hastings and Ostrom as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of official notice. Hastings does not disclose receiving subscriber feedback concerning selection of said additional playable media item, but official notice is taken that it is well known to receive feedback from subscribers or other customers. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to do so, for the obvious advantage of recommending items likely to be of interest to

subscribers, and thus making subscriptions more attractive, and collecting corresponding fees.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hastings and Ostrom as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of official notice. Hastings does not disclose that a subscriber is charged a fee when an additional playable media item is moved to the subscriber selection queue, but official notice is taken that it is well known to charge fees for various services or at various steps of a process. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to do so, for the obvious advantage of profiting from such fees.

Claims 32, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hastings and Ostrom as applied to claim 28 above, and further in view of official notice. Hastings does not disclose that the movies are distributed electronically to the subscribers, or that the delivery is by satellite transmission or broadband Internet-based connection, but official notice is taken that it is well known to distribute movies, electronically, by satellite transmission, or by broadband Internet-based connection. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to do so, for the obvious advantage of getting movies to customers without the delays of mailing or physical delivery.

Claim 35

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hastings et al. (U.S. Patent 6,584,450) in view of Ostrom ("With Newer Releases, Netflix Users Can Anticipate a "Very Long Wait"). Hastings discloses a method of distributing playable media items comprising the steps of: (a) setting up a subscriber selection queue for the subscriber to be controlled by the first computer, said subscriber selection queue consisting of a list of one or more playable media items; wherein said subscriber selection queue is set up at least in part in response to item selection directions provided by the subscriber; (b) setting up queue replenishment control rules for the subscriber selection queue, including an automatic queue refill option; and (c) monitoring said subscriber selection queue in accordance with the queue replenishment control rules to determine if changes should be made to the subscriber selection queue; wherein said subscriber delivery queue is maintained automatically for the subscriber to include at least one playable media item which could be delivered to such subscriber (column 4, lines 14-34; column 9, line 47, through column 10, line 14). Between the teaching of Hastings that the customer provides movie selection criteria (column 9, line 47, through column 10, line 14), and the teachings of a first computer carrying out operations (column 11, line 49, through column 13, line 53) and delivering products to subscribers (column 8, line 6, through column 9, line 39), automatically determining with the first computer if changes should be made to the subscriber selection queue is obvious and implied. It is likewise obvious for the monitoring to include analyzing the content and/or characteristics of other playable media items within the selection queue to determine the changes, so as to accomplish the disclosed purpose of providing the

subscriber with movies according to his selected criteria, as taught by Hastings. Hastings discloses modifying the subscriber selection queue to generate a new list of one or more playable media items (ibid., the generation of a new list being implied by the release of new movies with the subscriber's favorite actor or other specified characteristics), but Hastings does not disclose (d) modifying the subscriber selection queue to generate a new list of one or more playable media items based on a confirmation from the subscriber. However, Ostrom teaches modifying the subscriber queue based on a confirmation from the subscriber (paragraph beginning, "Selecting from Nearly 12,000 Titles"), and Hastings teaches a computer automatically carrying out operations (column 11, line 49, through column 13, line 53). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to do this, for the stated advantage of ensuring subscribers that they will receive new releases (or other preferred movies, presumably).

Hastings does not expressly disclose that steps (c) and (d) are repeated as needed when the automatic queue refill option is enabled so that the subscriber selection queue is maintained automatically for the subscriber so as to include at least one playable media item which is accepted for delivery by such subscriber, although Hastings does disclose replenishment control rules that can, in effect, include an automatic queue refill option (column 9, line 63, through column 10, line 14), and this automatic selection process appears to be directed to assuring a queue containing movies for subscribers to rent. However, Ostrom further teaches a recommendation process to lead consumers to movies they might not otherwise have known about

(paragraph beginning, "Using a proprietary algorithm-based technology"). Because this is described as "lead[ing] consumers to movies they might not otherwise have known about," rather than automatically delivering movies based on recommendations, and because, "Based on rentals driven by the Netflix recommendation system, the niche movie 'Memento' has become the ninth-most *requested* film of all time by Netflix users," it is implied that at least some movies are accepted for delivery by the subscribers. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for steps (c) and (d) to be repeated as needed when the automatic queue refill option is enabled so that the subscriber selection queue is maintained automatically for the subscriber so as to include at least one playable media item which is accepted for delivery by such subscriber, for the stated advantage of keeping Netflix's vast library in circulation, with the obvious advantage of making Netflix a valuable service for which subscribers are likely to remain willing to pay, and assuring that playable media items are actually desired by the subscribers.

Claim 36

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hastings et al. (U.S. Patent 6,584,450) in view of Ostrom ("With Newer Releases, Netflix Users Can Anticipate a 'Very Long Wait'") and official notice. Hastings discloses a method of distributing playable media items over an electronic network to a subscriber of a media rental service, the method comprising the steps of: (a) receiving subscriber preference data for the subscriber during a first data session network (column 4, lines 14-34;

column 9, line 47, through column 10, line 14); (b) generating a subscriber profile for the subscriber suitable for use by a recommender system; and (c) processing said subscriber profile using said recommender system to identify a media item that is likely to be of interest to the subscriber; wherein said media item can be automatically shipped to the subscriber after said first data session, and without requiring a second data session by the subscriber with said media rental service (ibid.; and Figure 7; column 12, lines 21-38). Hastings discloses various options for mailing or shipping the media item to the subscriber, and shipping the item to the subscriber (column 4, lines 22-34), but does not disclose that receiving subscriber preference data includes receiving notification and shipment options, and does not disclose notifying the subscriber. However, official notice is taken that it is well known to receive notification and shipping options (e.g., a mailing address to which an item is to be shipped, whether an item is to be shipped by regular or high-priority delivery, a telephone number or email to which notification is to be sent), and perform notification and/or shipping in accordance with the received option information. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to receive notification and shipment options, and perform notification and/or shipping in accordance therewith, for such obvious advantages of arranging for shipment to the proper address, notification to assure the subscriber that the media item was on its way, shipment with the degree of priority that the subscriber wanted and was willing to pay for, etc.

Hastings does not expressly disclose (e) repeating step (c) to automatically select and maintain at least one media item, but does disclose providing new releases to subscribers (*ibid.* and also column 11, lines 26-45), as does Ostrom, which implies repeating step (c) as new releases become available, to determine which subscribers are likely to be interested in which new releases. Hastings discloses delivering playable media items, with a wide range of possible criteria for triggering delivery (e.g., column 4, lines 14-34; column 5, lines 1-14), but does not expressly disclose (f) delivering at least one additional playable media item when it is accepted by the subscriber. However, Ostrom further teaches a recommendation process to lead consumers to movies they might not otherwise have known about (paragraph beginning, "Using a proprietary algorithm-based technology"). Because this is described as "lead[ing] consumers to movies they might not otherwise have known about," rather than automatically delivering movies based on recommendations, and because, "Based on rentals driven by the Netflix recommendation system, the niche movie 'Memento' has become the ninth-most *requested* film of all time by Netflix users," it is implied that at least some movies are accepted for delivery by the subscribers. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for playable media items to be delivered when they are accepted by subscribers, the obvious advantage of assuring that playable media items are actually desired by the subscribers, thus making Netflix a valuable service for which subscribers are likely to remain willing to pay.

Hastings does not expressly disclose (g) repeating step (e) when an automatic shipment option is enabled until said subscriber accepts an additional playable media item for delivery, but official notice is taken that it is well known for salespersons to repeatedly select items or information about items to be presented to potential customers. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to repeat step (e) when an automatic shipment option is enabled until said subscriber accepts an additional playable media item for delivery, for the obvious advantage of providing the subscriber with a media item likely to be to his taste, thereby making people more likely to see subscribing as worth the money.

Statement Regarding Enablement

Examiner has considered the amendments to the claims for support by the original specification and the Provisional to which priority is claimed. Although Applicant might be accused of steering rather close to the wind, Examiner has concluded that the claims cannot properly be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as lacking support.

Statement Regarding IDS

The Information Disclosure Statement of January 28, 2010, refers to an article by "Fields." The author's name is actually Field. Examiner has therefore not initialed the

article on the IDS, but has considered it, and makes it of record on the attached Notice of References Cited.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 30, 2009, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 36 in particular have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Ostrom has been applied in rejecting claim 36, which was previously rejected based on different art, in response to the amendment. Otherwise, the same prior art references have been applied, although in slightly different ways, to meet the current claim limitations.

Regarding claim 35, Applicant argues that "analyzing the content and/or characteristics of other playable media items within said subscriber selection queue" is not taught or suggested in the prior art. Examiner replies that it is obvious for the monitoring to include such analyzing, "so as to accomplish the disclosed purpose of providing the subscriber with movies according his selected criteria, as taught by Hastings."

As set forth in the rejection of claim 35, Hastings teaches that the customer provides movie selection criteria (column 9, line 47, through column 10, line 14), and teaches a first computer carrying out operations (column 11, line 49, through column 13, line 53) and delivering products to subscribers (column 8, line 6, through column 9, line 39)." Given that the provider attempts to provide movies to customer that best satisfy the preferences indicated by the movie selection criteria, as Hastings et al.

disclose in the first paragraph of column 10, analyzing the content and/or characteristics of playable media items is inherently requisite. Analyzing the content and/or characteristics of playable media items within the subscriber selection queue is held to be obvious in consequence of the analyzing and the existence of the subscriber selection queue. In accordance with the teachings of Hastings, a provider would have good motivation to analyze those playable media items for such reasons as determining whether or not a particular movie in the queue should be replaced by another movie more in accordance with a customer's preferences. Ostrom teaches that Netflix users often have a long wait, as a result of its large customer base and limited number of movies. Thus, if a movie on customer A's subscription queue is only weakly recommended for him, but much desired by customer B, as strongly matching his expressed preferences, and/or the recommendations of the Cinematch system, it would make sense to perform the analysis and transfer the movie to customer B's queue, while providing customer A with something else he is likely to like at least equally well.

The Supreme Court has ruled in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (U.S. 2007) that the teaching, suggestion or motivation test should not be applied as a rigid and mandatory formula that limits obviousness analysis through a formalistic conception of the words "teaching," "suggestion," and "motivation" or by overemphasis on the importance of published articles and explicit content of issued patents, since market demand, rather than scientific literature, often drives design trends, and granting patent protection to advances that would occur "in the ordinary course" without real innovation retards progress and may, in the case of patents

combining previously known elements, deprive prior inventions of their value or utility (1385-1386).

To quote further from *KSR* (at 1386), “[R]igid application of preventative rules that deny fact finders recourse to common sense are neither necessary nor consistent with precedent.”

The Court also noted in the *KSR* decision, “[I]f there is design need or market pressure to solve [a] problem, and there are [a] finite number of identified, predictable solutions, [a] person of ordinary skill in art has good reason to pursue known options within his or her technical grasp, and if this leads to anticipated success, it is likely product of ordinary skill and common sense, not innovation.”

Thus, in accordance with the *KSR* decision, analyzing the content and/or characteristics of playable media items within the subscriber selection queue meets the test of being one of a finite number of identified, predictable solutions to a problem which there is design need or market pressure to solve, and should therefore be considered obvious.

The common knowledge or well-known in the art statements in the previous office action are taken to be admitted prior art, because Applicant did not traverse Examiner's taking of official notice.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas D. Rosen, whose telephone number is 571-272-6762. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Smith, can be reached on 571-272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Non-official/draft communications can be faxed to the examiner at 571-273-6762.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 3625

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nicholas D. Rosen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3625
January 14, 2010